

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 2000-0033-C - ORDER NO. 2000-872
OCTOBER 25, 2000

IN RE: HTC Communications, Inc.,)	ORDER HOLDING
)	COMPLAINT IN
Complainant/Petitioner,)	ABEYANCE
)	
vs.)	
)	
AT&T Communications of the Southern)	
States, Inc.,)	
)	
Defendant/Respondent.)	

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the "Commission") by way of a letter from HTC Communications, Inc. ("HTCC" or the "Company") requesting that the Commission hold HTCC's complaint in abeyance, subject to reinstatement should there be a need to do so at a future time. The underlying issue in this case involves a complaint filed by HTCC against AT&T Communications of the Southern States, Inc. ("AT&T").

HTCC's complaint was filed with the Commission on January 17, 2000. On March 20, 2000, AT&T filed an Answer to HTCC's complaint with the Commission. The Consumer Advocate for the State of South Carolina filed a Petition to Intervene on April 14, 2000. Thereafter, on April 6, 2000, AT&T filed a Motion to Dismiss with the Commission and on April 28, 2000, HTCC filed a Return to AT&T's Motion to Dismiss.

On July 11, 2000, oral arguments on the Motion to Dismiss were heard by the Commission in the Commission's Hearing Room. The Commission denied AT&T's Motion to Dismiss in Order No. 2000-694 on August 23, 2000. On September 14, 2000, the Commission issued Order Number 2000-768 which established prefiling deadlines for testimony and exhibits.

On October 4, 2000, in a letter filed by counsel for HTCC, the Company respectfully requested that the Commission not dismiss HTCC's complaint, but hold the complaint in abeyance, subject to reinstatement should there be a need to do so at a future time. HTCC also stated in the letter dated October 4, 2000, that HTCC has determined that it must move forward in marketing its services, and has decided to charge AT&T switched access rates that do not exceed Verizon's rates.

We find that HTCC's reason for requesting that its complaint be held in abeyance reasonable. Additionally, we find that the Company should not be required to file testimony at this time.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

1. The Complaint of HTCC shall be held in abeyance and the Company shall not be required to file testimony at this time.

2. This Order shall remain in full force and effect until further Order of the Commission.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION:

Chairman

ATTEST:

Executive Director

(SEAL)